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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rapporteur’s report on session** | | |
| **Stream Number/WLD/Plenary:--- 1---** | | |
| **Repporteur’s name: --- Hillary Cherry---** | | |
| **Session ID:---237---** | | **Session Name: --- Measuring success and Failure of Protected Areas (session 1 of 2)---** |
| ***Summarize the session: Capture 1-3 main insights and findings of this session (including promising opportunities and inspiring solutions).*** | | |
| 1. **---** | While it is essential that PAs maintain biodiversity over the long-term, we do not have scientifically-based, overall picture of effectiveness of PAs. Variations in the studies presented in this session indicate more work (and data) is needed globally to measure effectiveness. A key theme was need for focus inside and outside of PAs. An analysis of wildlife outcomes as measure of PA effectiveness indicated that, while data only reflect “what people count” and that variation is substantial, overall: 1) species with large body mass have positive trends (focus should be on conserving smaller species); 2) socio-economic metrics indicated greater capacity for effective mgmt and reduction of threats in wealthier countries (wealthier nations need to support less wealthy). Need to plan to avoid conflict between livelihoods and biodiversity management. In practice, need to identify trade-offs and clear objectives and embed systematic monitoring into management. Another study used METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) which is a ‘score-card’ approach that evaluates input, context and Living Planet Database (LPD) to analyse mgmt effectiveness and related biodiversity outcomes: 111 PA sample size looked at PA inputs (resources, mgmt actions and legislation) and if these lead to conservation outcomes. Results of management input were variable and management input was not aligned to increases in effectiveness in PAs. This could be due to mgmt being ‘reactive’ rather than designed as treatment). Strong need for more data to better test relationship between PA inputs and outcomes. **---** | |
| 2. **---** | Case study from China: measuring PA status using formula that integrates ecosystem pattern, ecosystem quality, and human activity to determine effectiveness of PAs. 89% of PAs are stable or better; change is regionally-specific; land-use change is biggest driver for decline of PA effectiveness. Case stud: Do PAs conserve forests effectively? 20.1% of world forests are in PAs. This study compared forest status ‘inside vs outside’ of PAs: compared to ‘everything’ PAs were losing forest less rapidly. When using ‘matching’ methods, PAs still showed positive response, but less so than in un-matched analyses. Overall effectiveness of PAs for forest conservation was positive. Specifically, PAs showed positive response to reducing deforestation with regard to 1) on-ground management, 2) regulation, 3) remoteness, 4) altitude and 5) isolation. PAs showed negative response to reducing deforestation for 1) land-use, 2) fire, and 3) human population. **---** | |
| 3. **---** | Case study from tropics: Will tropical PAs act as “arks”? Legal and actual PA protection has improved; species ‘losers’ include apex predators, large non-predatory species, stream dwelling amphibians and fish, and large seeded trees; winners include disturbance and light-loving trees, lianas and vines, invasive species and human diseases. Overall Reserve Health Index indicates health is declining on average, but variable (~50% suffering and 50% succeeding). Over 4/5th showed decline and over ½ of those, significant decline: in these, there was an erosion of biodiversity both taxonomically and functionally. The best ‘on-ground’ protected areas were the least damaged. What is driving change: habitat destruction and exploitation both **inside and outside** reserve. What happens outside PA has strong correlation with what is happening inside. Found positive effect of PA management (best on-ground protection = least damage). Needs: Protect from internal habitat destruction and over-exploitation; manage forest inside and outside reserve especially with regard to land use change; drivers such as pollution and climate change were of lesser importance. Overall there is a positive effect of PAs on forests (condition, preventing deforestation) **---** | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Related keywords | | |
| ---Capacity Development--- | ---Enhancing Diversity and Quality of Governance--- | ---Reconciling Development Challenges--- |

| **Cross Cutting Themes** |
| --- |
| ***If the session was related to a Cross Cutting Theme, please give some information on what has been discussed.*** |
| **---**PAs should be viewed in a wider landscape context (i.e. working both inside and outside PAs) and this should extend to governance and capacity development, especially including those communities and agencies outside of PAs. An example is the protection of large-bodied wildlife such as tigers and elephants; while these species key populations exist within PAs, their range is largely across and outside PAs. Thus protection of their populations inside PAs is critical so that these populations can continue to act as ‘seed’ populations to outside areas**---** |

|  |
| --- |
| Related cross cutting theme |
| ---New Social Compact--- |

| **Recommendations to the IUCN World Parks Congress** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Capture any specific recommendation from this session for the Innovative Approaches documents / Promise of Sydney (along the line of policy changes, capacity development, financing, practice…)*** | | | |
|  | **It was recommended that:** | **Actors** | **Timeline** |
| 1. **---** | All parties work together and consolidate data sets to enable better analyses at global and national scales**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** |
| 2. **---** | Recognise PAs are critical for protection of large-bodied wildlife and that active monitoring, and direct protection of key populations is needed within PAs: Recognise these species are wide-ranging and there is also key need to maintain natural matrix and habitat connectivity inside and outside PAs**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** |
| 3. **---** | Click here to enter text.**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** | **---**Click here to enter text.**---** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Related keywords | | |
| ---Choose an item.--- | ---Choose an item.--- | ---Choose an item.--- |

| **Information for the Communications - Team** |
| --- |
| ***Note any announcements/commitments or people/items of interests to media/communications. Please ensure to include any relevant contact information.*** |
| **---**Click here to enter text.**---** |